Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
NOV 2 2017
OFFICE OF THE CLERK

No. 17-494

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

SOUTH DAKOTA,

Petitioner,

v.

WAYFAIR, INC., OVERSTOCK.COM, INC., AND NEWEGG, INC.

Respondents.

On Petition for a Writ of Certiorari to the South Dakota Supreme Court

BRIEF FOR *AMICUS CURIAE* STREAMLINED SALES TAX GOVERNING BOARD, INC. IN SUPPORT OF PETITIONER

R. BRUCE JOHNSON
R. BRUCE JOHNSON, LLC
2342 East Wrenhaven Lane
Holladay, Utah 84121
(801) 558-4128
rbrucejohnson@outlook.com

LAURA K. MCNALLY
Counsel of Record
ANDREW R. DEVOOGHT
LOEB & LOEB LLP
321 N. Clark Street
Suite 2300
Chicago, IL 60654
(312) 464-3155
lmcnally@loeb.com

Counsel for Amicus Curiae

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS i

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES iii

BRIEF FOR *AMICUS CURIAE* STREAMLINED SALES TAX GOVERNING BOARD, INC. IN SUPPORT OF PETITIONER 1

INTEREST OF THE *AMICUS CURIAE* 1

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT 4

ARGUMENT 6

The Streamlined Sales and Use Tax Agreement Has Eliminated Any Undue Burden on Interstate Commerce 6

A. The Practical Burdens of Compliance Formed the Foundations of *Bellas Hess* and *Quill.* 6

B. The Streamlined States Have Eliminated Any Undue Burdens On Sellers. 7

1. State and Local Taxes Are Administered at the State Level. 8

2. Tax Rates Are Standardized at the State Level. 8

3. Exemptions Are Standardized at the State Level. 9

4. Administrative Requirements Are Standardized Across All Member States. 10

a. Uniform Definitions. 10

b. Simplified Electronic Returns 11

c. Centralized Registration 11

d. Other Uniform Procedures. 12

5. Certified Service Providers Are Made Available to Remote Sellers at No Charge. .. 12

C. *Stare Decisis* Provides An Insufficient Basis to Deny Review. 13

CONCLUSION 15

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

Cases

Direct Marketing Ass'n v. Brohl, 135 S. Ct. 1124 (2015), (Kennedy, J., concurring) 4, 14

National Bellas Hess v. Department of Revenue of Illinois, 386 U.S. 753 (1967) 3, 6, 10

Quill v. North Dakota, 504 U.S. 298 (1992) 3, 7, 13

Other Authority

Streamlined Sales and Use Tax Agreement .....*passim*

BRIEF FOR *AMICUS CURIAE* STREAMLINED SALES TAX GOVERNING BOARD, INC. IN SUPPORT OF PETITIONER

INTEREST OF THE *AMICUS CURIAE*[1]

The Streamlined Sales Tax Governing Board (the "Governing Board") is the body that administers the Streamlined Sales and Use Tax Agreement (the "Agreement"),[2] a multi-State agreement that "simplif[ies] and modernize[s] sales and use tax administration in the member states in order to substantially reduce the burden of tax compliance." SSUTA § 102.

Forty-four States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico participated in the development of the Agreement. The Governing Board is currently comprised of 24 States. Twenty-three of these States (the "Streamlined States") fully comply with the

---

[1] Petitioners and Respondents filed Blanket Consents to the filing of *amicus* briefs with the Clerk's office on October 16, 2017 and October 19, 2017, respectively. On November 1, 2017, *Amicus* notified the parties of its intention to file this brief. *Amicus* affirms that no counsel for a party wrote this brief in whole or in part, and no counsel or party made a monetary contribution intended to fund the brief's preparation or submission.

[2] The Streamlined Sales and Use Tax Agreement ("SSUTA") may be found at http://tinyurl.com/SSUTA. This brief describes in general terms certain material provisions of the Agreement. There are of course more detailed elements to all of the provisions described below, and this brief is not intended as a comprehensive summary of all aspects of the Agreement.

Agreement and are full members of the Governing Board. SSUTA § 801.[3] One State, Tennessee, has "achieved substantial compliance with the terms of the Agreement taken as a whole, but not necessarily each provision," and is an associate member. SSUTA § 801.3. In addition, 20 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico serve the Governing Board as non-voting advisor States. SSUTA § 801.4.[4] The Governing Board is also advised by members of the private sector, through the Business Advisory Council, and representatives of local government, through the Local Government Advisory Council. SSUTA §§ 811, 812.[5]

The Streamlined States have all made the sovereign choice to obtain a significant component of their total revenue from sales taxes. Those States, which include the petitioning State of South Dakota, have enacted the requirements of the Streamlined

---

[3] The full member states are Arkansas, Georgia, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Michigan, Minnesota, Nebraska, Nevada, New Jersey, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Utah, Vermont, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin and Wyoming. A map of the Streamlined States can be found at http://tinyurl.com/StreamlinedStatesMap.

[4] The advisor states are Alabama, Arizona, California, Connecticut, District of Columbia, Florida, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Mississippi, Missouri, New Mexico, New York, Puerto Rico, South Carolina, Texas, and Virginia.

[5] The members of the Local Government Advisory Council are Government Finance Officers Association, National Association of Counties, National League of Cities, and U.S. Conference of Mayors.

Sales and Use Tax Agreement to allow sellers to take advantage of simplified sales tax administration and compliance enabled by the Agreement. In implementing the Agreement, the Streamlined States modified their sales tax laws and adopted numerous uniform definitions and administrative provisions. Streamlined States have designed and implemented technological solutions to address compliance and enforcement problems, and they work together, through the Governing Board, to monitor compliance with Agreement. SSUTA § 809.

Since 1999, the group of States (including South Dakota) that eventually became the Governing Board has devoted countless hours to developing a program that addresses the practical and pragmatic concerns identified by the Court in *National Bellas Hess v. Department of Revenue of Illinois*, 386 U.S. 753 (1967) and *Quill v. North Dakota*, 504 U.S. 298 (1992). Beyond those concerns, the Governing Board focuses its work on lessening burdens on participating sellers. The Business Advisory Council and Local Government Advisory Council assisted the Governing Board at every step, ensuring that the final Agreement covered the full range of participants in the sales tax system. In turn, the legislature of each Streamlined State took the baton from the Governing Board and revised statutes and regulations to come into compliance with the Agreement.

This enormous undertaking, spanning States from coast to coast and border to border, has resulted in a truly streamlined system of collecting sales taxes.

With this wealth of experience and full understanding of the modern practicalities of sales tax collection, the Governing Board has a significant interest in this Court reconsidering long-outdated assumptions underlying *Bellas Hess* and *Quill*, and this case represents "an appropriate case for this Court to reexamine" them. *See Direct Mktg. Ass'n v. Brohl*, 135 S. Ct. 1124, 1135 (2015), (Kennedy, J., concurring).

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

It is fitting that this Court's last case examining a State's ability to obligate a seller to collect and remit sales taxes on purchases delivered into the State goes by the name *Quill*, an iconic writing device belonging to another century and entirely unsuited to today's business world.

Equally anachronistic are the practical considerations underlying the decisions in *Quill* and its predecessor *Bellas Hess*. When those cases were decided, the thought that retailers in one State could feasibly calculate, collect, and remit sales taxes owing to far-flung jurisdictions was as unthinkable to many as the idea that we would all soon walk around with supercomputers in our pockets or even on our wrists.

Today, thanks to the hard work of State legislators, tax administrators, local government officials, and their partners in the business communities, the Streamlined Sales and Use Tax Agreement has dismantled each of the practical roadblocks identified by this Court in *Quill* and *Bellas Hess*. Through this Agreement, sales tax

administration now includes centralized administration, simplified rate and exemption structures, and streamlined recordkeeping. The Agreement also provides remote sellers[6] with the option to use Certified Service Providers, paid for by the participating States, that eliminate the burdens on the sellers related to determining the taxability of products, calculating the appropriate tax, preparing and filing the required returns, making the remittances and resolving any audits or notices received by those sellers.

As described in detail in the Petitioner's brief, *Quill* is no longer consistent with modern Commerce Clause jurisprudence from this Court. Other *amici* have described how *Quill* is ironically *damaging* interstate commerce. As discussed below, the Streamlined Sales and Use Tax Agreement is clear evidence that not even *stare decisis* should provide a basis for declining another look at *Quill*. The practical considerations that provided a foundation for that case have entirely eroded. This case provides the best, cleanest vehicle for considering the question presented, and the Governing Board urges this Court to grant the Petition.

---

[6] The term "remote seller(s)" as used in this brief has the same meaning as the term "volunteer seller" as defined in Section D.2.(b) of the contract the Governing Board has with the Certified Service Providers. The contract may be found at http://tinyurl.com/CSPContract.

ARGUMENT

The Streamlined Sales and Use Tax Agreement Has Eliminated Any Undue Burden on Interstate Commerce.

A. The Practical Burdens of Compliance Formed the Foundations of *Bellas Hess* and *Quill*.

In 1967, with both the postal zip code system and the nationwide direct dial telephone system only a few years old, this Court struck an Illinois law requiring out-of-state mail order companies to collect Illinois sales taxes on sales into Illinois. *Bellas Hess*, 386 U.S. at 759–60. The Court grounded its holding in the practical burdens that would derive from every State and municipality requiring sellers in every other State and municipality to collect their taxes. "The many variations in rates of tax, in allowable exemptions, and in administrative and record-keeping requirements could entangle National's interstate business in a virtual welter of complicated obligations to local jurisdictions with no legitimate claim to impose 'a fair share of the cost of the local government.'" *Id.* (footnotes omitted.) In light of the many different local and State tax regimes, the Court held that "if just the localities which now impose the tax were to realize anything like their potential of out-of-State registrants the recordkeeping task of multistate sellers would be clearly intolerable." *Id.* at 759 n.14 (internal quotations omitted).

In 1992, two years before the world's first secure retail transaction over the Web, this Court revisited

the issue of cross-State sales tax collection in *Quill*, 504 U.S. 298. Although the Court recognized that modern Commerce Clause jurisprudence might not dictate the same result, *id.* at 311, it reaffirmed *Bellas Hess* on *stare decisis* grounds. *Id.* at 317. In doing so, it calculated the number of taxing jurisdictions to be more than 6,000 and again noted the burden on sellers that would result from a collection requirement. *Id.* at 313 n. 6.

B. The Streamlined States Have Eliminated Any Undue Burdens On Sellers.

The Governing Board studied *Bellas Hess* and *Quill*, determined to create a voluntary multi-State agreement that would address the Court's concerns. The Board recognized that the Court was concerned with the variations in sales tax rates, allowable exemptions, and administrative and recordkeeping requirements in States and local jurisdictions throughout the country. Working with input from States, municipalities, and the private sector, the Governing Board created the Agreement guided by a statement of purpose that directly answered the Supreme Court concerns: "It is the purpose of this Agreement to simplify and modernize sales and use tax administration in the member states in order to substantially reduce the burden of tax compliance." SSUTA § 102. It is with no small amount of pride that the Governing Board can today say that the Streamlined Sales and Use Tax Agreement has addressed the practical problems identified in *Bellas Hess* and *Quill* relating to multiplicity of jurisdictions,

rates, exemptions, and record-keeping requirements.[7] For proof that the Agreement, along with technological innovations, have removed the collection and reporting burdens, this Court need look no further than the list of over 3,600 sellers who have voluntarily registered to collect and remit taxes, as of October 1, 2017 in all of the Streamlined States, regardless of any physical presence in those states.

1. State and Local Taxes Are Administered at the State Level.

The keystone simplification required by the Agreement is State-level administration for *all* sales and use taxes imposed by the State or its political subdivisions. SSUTA § 301. Sellers are only required to register with, file returns with, and remit funds to the State-level authority and can only be audited by that central authority. The central authority, then, is responsible for distributing any applicable local taxes to the appropriate jurisdictions.

2. Tax Rates Are Standardized at the State Level.

The Agreement has reduced the number of different sales tax rates in place in each jurisdiction. In selecting its sales tax rate, each State must

---

[7] All of the provisions discussed below, which remove any undue burdens on sellers, apply fully to remote sellers that voluntarily register under the Agreement and make sales into the State of South Dakota (and all other Streamlined States).

generally select a single State-wide rate, and the same is true for each local jurisdiction. SSUTA § 308.

The Agreement also requires each State to provide an easily-accessible, searchable, and current database of all the sales tax rates for all of the jurisdictions levying taxes within the State. SSUTA § 307. Streamlined States agree to provide 60 days' notice to sellers (120 days in the case of catalog sellers) of local rate changes and limits their effective date to the first day of a calendar quarter. *Id.* at § 305.

Critically, Streamlined States relieve sellers from all liability for any errors in the database. SSUTA § 306. Thus, the Member States, and their local partners, have made every effort to relieve a retailer's burden in this area.

3. Exemptions Are Standardized at the State Level.

Streamlined States also generally agree to a single statewide set of tax exemptions that apply to both State and local taxes. As a result, rather than hundreds or even thousands of sets of exemptions, there is generally only one set of exemptions per State. SSUTA § 316.

For exemptions based on the status of the purchaser (such as an exemption for charitable organizations), or the use of the purchased item (such as an item used in manufacturing), Streamlined States agree that the seller need only require the purchaser

to provide an electronic or written exemption certificate. SSUTA § 317. Absent some type of fraud on the part of the seller, if the seller obtains and retains the necessary information, it is absolved of any liability if the customer is later deemed to have claimed the exemption improperly. *Id.* Thus, the basis for the Court's concern in *Bellas Hess*, 386 U.S. 759 n. 14, that the application of exemptions "especially for the industrial retailer – turns on facts which are often too remote and uncertain for the level of accuracy demanded by the prescribed system" has been eliminated.

Product-based exemptions (such as exemptions for food or health care items) have been similarly standardized State-wide. These exemptions are subject to uniform definitions and are downloadable in a "taxability matrix." SSUTA § 328. As with many other provisions of the Agreement, a retailer who relies on the taxability matrix is absolved of liability for under-collection of tax resulting from erroneous data in the taxability matrix. SSUTA § 328.C.

4. Administrative Requirements Are Standardized Across All Member States.

The Agreement also addresses the Court's concern about multiple administrative and recordkeeping requirements.

a. Uniform Definitions. The Agreement requires Streamlined States to adopt uniform definitions of many administrative terms, such as "bundled

transactions,"[8] "delivery charges," "direct mail," "lease or rental," "purchase price," "retail sale," "sales price," "telecommunications nonrecurring charges," and "tangible personal property." SSUTA Appendix C, Library of Definitions.

b. Simplified Electronic Returns. Multistate sales tax compliance is also greatly simplified through a simplified electronic return. *See generally* SSUTA § 318. No Streamlined State may require more than one return per State for each reporting period; each State return must include all local taxing jurisdictions in the State; and no State can require the return sooner than twenty days after the close of the reporting period. The return itself is in a uniform format approved by the Governing Board and no State may require additional data elements. The Streamlined States also must adopt standardized processes for receiving the information returns and for accepting electronic payments. SSUTA § 319.

c. Centralized Registration. Each Streamlined State participates in a single central online registration system. SSUTA § 303. Thus, a retailer registers once on one site and is then automatically registered for all the Streamlined States. SSUTA § 401. Any change to a retailer's information, such as changes in address, contact information or similar items, may be made for all jurisdictions by a one-time change on the central site. A retailer no longer has to

---

[8] A "bundled transaction" is one where two or more items are sold for a single price, but the component items are not all subject to the sales tax. SSUTA § 330.

update the information separately for every jurisdiction. SSUTA § 303.J.

d. Other Uniform Procedures. In addition to the simplifications outlined above, there are myriad other uniform procedures that the Streamlined States have agreed to, including, uniform sourcing rules to prevent double taxation (SSUTA §§ 309, 310, 310.1, 311, 313, 313.1, and 314), uniform rules for the enactment and administration of exemptions (SSUTA §§ 316 and 317), uniform rules for the recovery of bad debts (SSUTA § 320), uniform provisions governing sales tax holidays (SSUTA § 322), limitations on caps and thresholds (SSUTA § 323), uniform rounding rules (SSUTA § 324), and standardized customer privacy requirements (SSUTA § 321).

5. Certified Service Providers Are Made Available to Remote Sellers at No Charge.

In an effort to further alleviate the burden on sellers, the Governing Board has contracted with Certified Service Providers to handle *all* sales and use tax functions for remote sellers and have *the Streamlined States compensate the Certified Service Providers for these services.*

Certified Service Providers perform all of the retailer's sales and use tax functions, other than the retailer's obligation to remit tax on its own purchases. SSUTA § 203 and CSP Contract Section B.1.[9] By using

---

[9] The CSP Contract may be found at http://tinyurl.com/CSPContract.

a Certified Service Provider, the remote seller is relieved of any burden to determine the taxability of its products, calculate the rate of applicable tax, prepare and file the return, or respond to audits.

These Certified Service Providers must meet stringent requirements for accuracy, financial stability, and taxpayer confidentiality. SSUTA § 501. Critically, with limited exceptions, the retailer who uses a Certified Service Providers is relieved of virtually all liability, in the absence of fraud, for any errors in compliance. SSUTA § 502.

C. *Stare Decisis* Provides An Insufficient Basis to Deny Review.[10]

The Governing Board is justifiably proud of this broad-based Agreement, and a refusal by this Court to grant the Petition may well harm such efforts in the future. We expect that a denial of certiorari would discourage additional States from joining the Agreement, thereby stagnating the benefits streamlining provides to the States, the participating sellers, and the national economy. Worse, a denial by this Court, despite the decades-long efforts by the States (including South Dakota), local governments,

---

[10] Justice White noted in his *Quill* dissent that "The Court hints, but does not state directly, that a basis for its invocation of *stare decisis* is a fear that overturning *Bellas Hess* will lead to the imposition of retroactive liability." 504 U.S. at 332 (White, J., dissenting). As Justice White noted, that conclusion need not follow, and in all events, retroactivity can be addressed directly by the Court. *Id.*

and the business communities to ameliorate each of the practical concerns that drove *Bellas Hess* and *Quill*, could well serve to chill these types of cooperative efforts in the future.

Put simply, *Quill* deserves another look. The practical realities that explicitly or impliedly justified the physical-presence test no longer apply. Indeed, in these days of telecommuting, pop-up operations, and electronic commerce, the task of determining "physical presence" (and therefore a *Quill*-based obligation to collect) may well be more pragmatically difficult than simply collecting and remitting taxes through the mechanism set up by the Agreement.

As Justice Kennedy noted in his concurrence in *Direct Marketing Ass'n v. Brohl*, "[a] case questionable even when decided, *Quill* now harms States to a degree far greater than could have been anticipated earlier." 135 S. Ct. at 1135 (Kennedy, J., concurring). In light of these undeniable changes, "it is unwise to delay any longer a reconsideration of the Court's holding in *Quill*." *Id.*

CONCLUSION

The Petition for a Writ of Certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

R. BRUCE JOHNSON
R. BRUCE JOHNSON, LLC
2342 East Wrenhaven Lane
Holladay, Utah 84121
(801) 558-4128
rbrucejohnson@outlook.com

LAURA K. MCNALLY
Counsel of Record
ANDREW R. DEVOOGHT
LOEB & LOEB LLP
321 N. Clark Street
Suite 2300
Chicago, IL 60654
(312) 464-3155
lmcnally@loeb.com

Counsel for Amicus Curiae

November 2, 2017